

CNOR text for greater sage-grouse (western, Washington / Columbia DPS, bi-state)

<p>October 30, 2001 Western sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus phaios</i>), Washington DPS—The Washington DPS (Columbia basin) of the western sage grouse currently occupies approximately 10 percent of its historic distribution in the state in two relatively small areas in central Washington. The abundance of this DPS has declined between 66 percent and 99 percent from historic levels (using low and high estimates). Primary threats to this population include conversion or degradation of native shrub-steppe habitats and small population size, which makes this population more susceptible to inbreeding depression (reduced reproductive vigor) and extirpation from stochastic events (inclement weather, population demographics, altered predation patterns, etc.). Because these threats are low to moderate in magnitude but imminent, we assigned this DPS of western sage grouse a listing priority number of 9.</p>	<p>June 13, 2002 Western sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus phaios</i>), Washington DPS—We changed the listing priority number from a 9 to a 6 because the threats are now of a high magnitude for the species based on the small and fragmented nature of the population and by a 30 percent decline in abundance of this DPS between 2000 and 2001. While this species exhibits natural fluctuations in population size, the overall population estimate of approximately 700 individuals is the lowest ever recorded. However, there is no apparent direct cause-and-effect between the identified threats and the recent decline. We also have determined that the threats previously considered imminent are no longer imminent. Military training constitutes the primary threat to the southern population, while habitat conversion (primarily loss of Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) acreage) is the primary threat impacting the northern subpopulation. We have concluded that threats related to military training are not imminent,</p>	<p>May 4, 2004 Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>), Columbia Basin DPS—The following summary is based on information in our files and the petition received on June 21, 1999. Currently, the AOU recognizes two subspecies of greater sage-grouse. Compared to the eastern subspecies (<i>C. u. urophasianus</i>), the western subspecies (<i>C. u. phaios</i>) has reduced white markings and darker grayish-brown feathering, resulting in a more dusky overall appearance. Based on recent communications with recognized experts, some disagreement as to the validity of these current subspecies designations exists. With regard to current taxonomic standards and information generated over the last few decades, these subspecies designations may be inappropriate. When informed taxonomic opinion is not unanimous, the Service evaluates the available information. The Service has conducted a detailed analysis of available information and has determined that the subspecies designations for greater sage-grouse are</p>	<p>May 11, 2005 Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>), Columbia Basin DPS—We have not updated our finding with regard to the Columbian Basin DPS of the greater sage-grouse in this notice. In the previous CNOR, we found that a listing proposal for this DPS was still warranted but precluded by higher priorities, and we assigned the DPS a listing priority number of 6. Since that time, new information has become available through the status review of the greater sage-grouse (range-wide). We will use the best scientific and commercial information available (including, but not limited to information that became available during the range-wide status review) to reevaluate whether the Columbia Basin population still qualifies as a DPS under our DPS policy, and if it does, whether the DPS still warrants a listing proposal. Once that evaluation is completed we will publish an updated finding for this DPS in the Federal Register either in the next CNOR or in a separate notice.</p>	<p>September 12, 2006 Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>), Columbia Basin DPS—We have not updated our finding with regard to the Columbian Basin DPS of the greater sage-grouse in this notice. In the May 4, 2004, notice, we found that a listing proposal for this DPS was still warranted but precluded by higher priorities, and maintained its listing priority number of 6. The following summary is based on information in our files and a petition, dated May 14, 1999, requesting the listing of the Washington population of western sage grouse (<i>C. u. phaios</i>). Currently, the American Ornithologists' Union recognizes two subspecies of greater sage-grouse. Compared to the eastern subspecies (<i>C. u. urophasianus</i>), the western subspecies has reduced white markings and darker grayish-brown feathering, resulting in a more dusky overall appearance. Pursuant to Service policy (61 FR 4722), on May 7, 2001, we concluded that listing the Columbia Basin DPS of western sage grouse, which was historically found in</p>
--	---	--	---	---

CNOR text for greater sage-grouse (western, Washington / Columbia DPS, bi-state)

	<p>June 13, 2002 (cont'd) based on the implementation of the Army's conservation measures, and considerably lower levels of actual training (from planned activities) occurring in Yakima and Kittitas Counties. We have likewise concluded that the threat to the northern population from habitat conversion is also not imminent, because much of the CRP acreage that could have expired was re-signed and increased in 1998 in Douglas County. Thus, threats previously classified as imminent are actually non-imminent in nature.</p>	<p>May 4, 2004 (cont'd) inappropriate given current taxonomic standards (68 FR 6500, February 7, 2003). However, the Service still considers the Columbia Basin population to be a Distinct Population Segment. The abundance of greater sage-grouse within the Columbia Basin DPS declined by approximately 30 percent between 2000 and 2001. Of even greater concern is the estimated reduction in size of the larger subpopulation in Douglas and Grant Counties, Washington, which accounted for the majority of the decline (dropping from 684 in 2000 to 395 in 2001, or approximately 42 percent). The current, overall population estimate of roughly 700 individuals is the lowest ever recorded for the Columbia Basin DPS, although it is just slightly lower than the previous lowest estimate recorded in 1994. Since 1970, the estimated population lows for the Columbia Basin DPS have occurred "regularly" over a 3- to 4-year period at mid-decade (e.g., 1975–78, 1985–87, and 1993–96). Should this cyclical pattern in population abundance hold, we may expect further significant declines in the Columbia Basin DPS over the next</p>		<p>September 12, 2006 (cont'd) northern Oregon and central Washington, was warranted, but precluded by higher priority listing actions (66 FR 22984). The Service subsequently received two petitions requesting the listing of the entire ranges of the nominal western and eastern subspecies of greater sage-grouse, dated January 24 and July 3, 2002, respectively. However, based on communications with recognized experts, disagreement as to the validity of these subspecies designations exists. When informed taxonomic opinion is not unanimous, the Service must evaluate the available information with regard to our section 4 listing responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act (USFWS 1992). We subsequently concluded that the subspecies designations for greater sage-grouse are inappropriate given current taxonomic standards (68 FR 6500 and 69 FR 933). In response to recent judicial direction (Institute for Wildlife Protection v. Norton (9th Cir. 2005, Unpublished opinion)), we are in the process of revisiting our current interpretation of the taxonomic status of the</p>
--	---	--	--	---

CNOR text for greater sage-grouse (western, Washington / Columbia DPS, bi-state)

		<p>May 4, 2004 (cont'd)</p> <p>several years. Military training constitutes the primary threat to the southern subpopulation, while habitat conversion is the primary threat impacting the northern subpopulation. However, we conclude that threats related to military training are not imminent, based on the implementation of the Army's conservation measures and considerably less-than-planned training activities occurring in Yakima and Kittitas Counties. Large areas of privately owned lands in Douglas County are currently withdrawn from crop production and planted to native and non-native cover under the Federal Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), established in 1985. Lands under the CRP are very important to the northern subpopulation of the Columbia Basin DPS. Much of the CRP acreage that could have expired was reenrolled and total CRP acreage increased in 1998 in Douglas County. As such, we conclude that the high magnitude, nonimminent threats to the Columbia Basin DPS of the greater sage grouse, leading to the assignment of a listing priority number of 6.</p>		<p>September 12, 2006 (cont'd)</p> <p>greater sage-grouse subspecies. We will publish an updated finding addressing the Columbia Basin DPS in the Federal Register, either in the next CNOR or in a separate notice, following our judicially-directed reassessment of the species' taxonomy.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

CNOR text for greater sage-grouse (western, Washington / Columbia DPS, bi-state)

<p>December 6, 2007 Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>), Columbia Basin DPS— We have not updated our finding with regard to the Columbia Basin DPS of the greater sage-grouse in this notice. The following summary is based on information in our files and a petition, dated May 14, 1999, requesting the listing of the Washington population of western sage-grouse (<i>C. u. phaios</i>). Pursuant to Service policy (61 FR 4722), on May 7, 2001, we concluded that listing the Columbia Basin DPS of western sage-grouse, which was historically found in northern Oregon and central Washington, was warranted, but precluded by higher priority listing actions (66 FR 22984). In the May 4, 2004, notice, we found that a listing proposal for this DPS was still warranted but precluded by higher priorities, and maintained its LPN of 6. In the intervening time, the Service received two petitions requesting the listing of the entire ranges of the nominal western and eastern subspecies of greater sage-grouse, dated January 24 and July 3, 2002, respectively. However, based on communications with recognized sage-grouse experts, disagreement as to the validity of an eastern and western subspecies of sage-grouse existed. Due to this disagreement in the scientific community, the Service evaluated the available information with</p>	<p>December 10, 2008 Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>), Columbia Basin DPS— For the reasons discussed below, we have not updated our finding with regard to the Columbia Basin DPS of the western subspecies of the greater sage-grouse (<i>C. u. phaios</i>) in this notice. The following summary is based on information in our files and a petition, dated May 14, 1999, requesting the listing of the Washington population of western sage grouse. On May 7, 2001, we concluded that listing the Columbia Basin DPS of western sage grouse was warranted but precluded by higher priority listing actions (66 FR 22984); this DPS was historically found in northern Oregon and central Washington. The Service subsequently received two petitions requesting the listing of the entire ranges of what the petitions called the western and eastern subspecies of greater sage-grouse, dated January 24 and July 3, 2002, respectively. The petition involving the western sage-grouse requested listing the subspecies in northern California through Oregon and Washington (including the Columbia Basin DPS, for which we had already concluded listing was warranted but precluded), as well as any western sage-grouse still occurring in parts of Idaho. In evaluating the two petitions, we</p>	<p>November 9, 2009 Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>), Columbia Basin DPS— For the reasons discussed below, we have not included new information in our finding with regard to the Columbia Basin DPS of the greater sage-grouse in this notice. On May 14, 1999, we received a petition requesting the listing of the Washington population of the western sage grouse (<i>C. u. phaios</i>). On May 7, 2001, we concluded that listing the Columbia Basin DPS of western sage grouse was warranted, but precluded by higher priority listing actions (66 FR 22984); this population was historically found in northern Oregon and central Washington. Following our May 7, 2001, finding, the Service received additional petitions requesting listing actions for various other greater sage-grouse populations, including one for the nominal western subspecies, dated January 24, 2002, and three for the entire species, dated June 18, 2002, and March 19 and December 22, 2003. The Service subsequently found that the petition for the western subspecies did not present substantial information (68 FR 6500), and that listing the greater sage-grouse throughout its historical range was not warranted (70 FR 2244).</p>	<p>November 10, 2010 Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)—We previously announced candidate status for this species, and described the reasons and data on which the finding was based, in a separate warranted-but-precluded 12-month petition finding published on March 23, 2010 (75 FR 13910). Greater sage-grouse, Bi-State DPS (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)—We previously announced candidate status for this species, and described the reasons and data on which the finding was based, in a separate warranted-but-precluded 12-month petition finding published on March 23, 2010 (75 FR 13910). Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>), Columbia Basin DPS— The following summary is based on information in our files and a petition, dated May 14, 1999, requesting the listing of the Washington population of the western sage-grouse (<i>C. u. phaios</i>). On May 7, 2001, we concluded that listing the Columbia Basin DPS of the western sage-grouse was warranted, but precluded by higher-priority listing actions (66 FR 22984); this population was historically found in northern Oregon and central Washington. Following our May 7, 2001, finding, the Service received additional petitions requesting listing actions for various other greater sage-grouse populations, including one for the nominal western subspecies, dated January 24, 2002, and three for the entire species, dated June 18, 2002, and March 19 and December 22, 2003. The Service subsequently found that the petition for the western subspecies did not present substantial information (68 FR 6500), and that listing the greater sage-grouse throughout its historical range was not warranted (70 FR 2244). These latter findings were remanded to the Service</p>
---	---	---	---

CNOR text for greater sage-grouse (western, Washington / Columbia DPS, bi-state)

<p>December 6, 2007 (cont'd)</p> <p>regard to our section 4 listing responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act (USFWS 1992). The Service subsequently concluded that the eastern and western subspecies designations for greater sage-grouse are inappropriate given current taxonomic standards (68 FR 6500 and 69 FR 933). The Institute for Wildlife Protection filed a court complaint, dated June 6, 2003, challenging the merits of the 90-day finding. On August 10, 2004, a U.S. District Court judge issued an order in favor of the USFWS and dismissing the plaintiff's case. An appeal, dated November 24, 2004, was filed by the Institute for Wildlife Protection regarding this decision. On March 3, 2006, the 9th Circuit Court remanded the finding back to the Service to revisit the 90-day finding regarding the conclusion that the western sage-grouse is not a subspecies. The Court did uphold that the petitioned population (western sage-grouse) does not constitute a DPS. We will publish an updated finding addressing the Columbia Basin DPS in the Federal Register following our assessment of the remand.</p>	<p>December 10, 2008 (cont'd)</p> <p>communicated with recognized sage-grouse experts, and discovered there was disagreement as to the taxonomic validity of these subspecies of the greater sage-grouse. Due to this disagreement in the scientific community, the we evaluated the available information and concluded that the eastern and western subspecies designations for greater sage-grouse are inappropriate given current taxonomic standards, which also meant they were not listable entities under the Act. We also concluded that the eastern and western populations did not constitute DPSs of the greater sage-grouse. Therefore, we published findings that the petitions did not present substantial information indicating that what the petitions had identified as the western or eastern subspecies may be warranted for listing under the Act (68 FR 6500 and 69 FR 933, respectively). The Institute for Wildlife Protection filed a court complaint, dated June 6, 2003, challenging the merits of our 90-day finding on the petition to list the western subspecies. On August 10, 2004, a U.S. District Court judge ruled in favor of the Service and dismissed the plaintiff's case. An appeal, dated November 24, 2004, was filed by the Institute for Wildlife Protection. On March 3, 2006, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals remanded the 90-day finding to the Service on the grounds that we did not provide an adequate basis for concluding that</p>	<p>November 9, 2009 (cont'd)</p> <p>Legal actions are still pending for these latter findings, which have been remanded to the Service for further consideration. In response, we initiated a new range-wide status review for the entire species (73 FR 10218). We will update our candidate assessment and publish a new finding for the Columbia Basin DPS in the Federal Register following completion of the new range wide status review for the greater sage-grouse.</p>	<p>November 10, 2010 (cont'd)</p> <p>for further consideration. In response, we initiated a new range-wide status review for the entire species (73 FR 10218). On March 5, 2010, we found that listing of the greater sage-grouse was warranted but precluded by higher priority listing actions (75 FR 13909; March 23, 2010), and it was added to the list of candidates. We also found that the western subspecies of the greater sage-grouse, the taxonomic entity we relied on in our DPS analysis for the Columbia Basin population, was no longer considered a valid subspecies. In light of our conclusions regarding the invalidity of the western sage-grouse subspecies, the significance of the Columbia Basin DPS to the greater sage-grouse will require further review. As priorities allow the Service intends to complete an analysis to determine if this population continues to warrant recognition as a DPS in accordance with our Policy Regarding the Recognition of Distinct Population (61 FR 4722; February 7, 1996). Until that time, the Columbia Basin DPS will remain a candidate for listing as a separate population of greater sage-grouse. Even if this population does not meet our DPS policy, the greater sage-grouse population in the Columbia Basin will remain a candidate for listing as part of the greater sage-grouse entity.</p>
---	---	--	---

CNOR text for greater sage-grouse (western, Washington / Columbia DPS, bi-state)

	<p>December 10, 2008 (cont'd)</p> <p>the petition failed to present substantial information indicating the western sage-grouse may be a valid subspecies. The Court did, however, uphold our conclusion that the petitioned entity (western sage-grouse) does not constitute a DPS of the greater sage-grouse. On April 29, 2008, we published a substantial 90-day petition finding which concluded that the petition presented substantial information indicating that listing the western subspecies of the greater sage-grouse may be warranted, announced that we were initiating a status review, and requested relevant information from the public (73 FR 23170). We will publish an updated finding addressing the Columbia Basin DPS in the Federal Register after completing our status review and 12-month petition finding regarding the petition to list the western subspecies of the greater sage-grouse.</p>		
--	--	--	--

CNOR text for greater sage-grouse (western, Washington / Columbia DPS, bi-state)

<p>October 26, 2011</p> <p>Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)—The following summary is based on information in our files and in the petition we received on January 30, 2002. Currently, greater sage-grouse occur in 11 States (Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, South Dakota, and North Dakota), and 2 Canadian provinces (Alberta and Saskatchewan), occupying approximately 56 percent of their historical range. Greater sage-grouse depend on a variety of shrub-steppe habitats throughout their life cycle, and are considered obligate users of several species of sagebrush. The primary threat to greater sage-grouse is ongoing fragmentation and loss of shrub-steppe habitats through a variety of mechanisms. Most importantly, increasing fire cycles and invasive plants (and the interaction between them) in more westerly parts of the range, along with energy development and related infrastructure in more easterly areas are negatively affecting species’ persistence. In addition, direct loss of habitat and fragmentation is occurring due to agriculture, urbanization, and infrastructure such as roads and power lines built in support of several activities. We also have determined that existing regulatory mechanisms are inadequate to protect the species from these ongoing threats. However, many of these habitat impacts are being actively addressed through conservation actions taken by local working groups, and State and Federal agencies. Notably, the National Resource Conservation Service has committed significant financial and technical resources to address threats to this species on private lands through their Sage-grouse Initiative. These efforts, when fully implemented, will potentially provide important conservation benefits to the greater sage-grouse and its habitats. We consider the threats to the greater sage-grouse to be of moderate magnitude, because the threats are</p>	<p>November 21, 2012</p> <p>Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)—The following summary is based on information in our files and in the petition we received on January 30, 2002. Currently, greater sage-grouse occur in 11 States (Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, South Dakota, and North Dakota), and 2 Canadian provinces (Alberta and Saskatchewan), occupying approximately 56 percent of their historical range. Greater sage-grouse depend on a variety of shrub-steppe habitats throughout their life cycle, and are considered obligate users of several species of sagebrush. The primary threat to greater sage-grouse is ongoing fragmentation and loss of shrub-steppe habitats through a variety of mechanisms. Most importantly, increasing fire cycles and invasive plants (and the interaction between them) in more westerly parts of the range, along with energy development and related infrastructure in more easterly areas, are negatively affecting species. In addition, direct loss of habitat and fragmentation is occurring due to agriculture, urbanization, and infrastructure such as roads and power lines built in support of several activities. We also have determined that existing regulatory mechanisms are inadequate to protect the species from these ongoing threats. However, many of these habitat impacts are being actively addressed through conservation actions taken by local working groups, and State and Federal agencies. Notably, the National Resource Conservation Service has committed significant financial and technical resources to address threats to this species on private lands through their Sage-grouse Initiative. These efforts, when fully implemented, will potentially provide important conservation benefits to the greater sage-grouse and its habitats. We consider the threats to the greater sage-grouse to be of moderate magnitude, because the threats are not occurring with uniform intensity</p>	<p>November 22, 2013</p> <p>Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)—The following summary is based on information in our files and in the petition we received on January 30, 2002. Currently, greater sage-grouse occur in 11 States (Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, South Dakota, and North Dakota), and 2 Canadian provinces (Alberta and Saskatchewan), occupying approximately 56 percent of their historical range. Greater sage-grouse depend on a variety of shrub-steppe habitats throughout their life cycle, and are obligate users of several species of sagebrush. The primary threat to greater sage-grouse is ongoing fragmentation and loss of shrub-steppe habitats through a variety of mechanisms. Most importantly, increasing fire cycles and invasive plants (and the interaction between them) in more westerly parts of the range, along with energy development and related infrastructure in more easterly areas, are negatively affecting species. In addition, direct loss of habitat and fragmentation is occurring due to agriculture, urbanization, and infrastructure such as roads and power lines built in support of several activities. We also have determined that currently existing regulatory mechanisms are inadequate to protect the species from these ongoing threats. However, many of these habitat impacts are being actively addressed through conservation actions taken by local working groups, and State and Federal agencies. Notably, the National Resource Conservation Service has committed significant financial and technical resources to address threats to this species on private lands through their Sage-grouse Initiative. These efforts, when fully implemented, will potentially provide important conservation benefits to the greater sage-grouse and its habitats. We consider the threats to the greater sage-grouse to be of moderate magnitude, because the threats are not occurring with uniform intensity</p>
--	--	---

CNOR text for greater sage-grouse (western, Washington / Columbia DPS, bi-state)

<p>October 26, 2011 (cont'd) not occurring with uniform intensity or distribution across the wide range of the species at this time, and substantial habitat still remains to support the species in many areas. The threats are imminent because the species is currently facing them in many portions of its range. Therefore, we assigned the greater sage-grouse an LPN of 8.</p> <p>Greater sage-grouse, Bi-State DPS (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)—We continue to find that listing this species is warranted, but precluded as of the date of publication of this notice. However, we are working on a proposed listing rule that we expect to publish prior to making the next annual resubmitted petition 12-month finding.</p> <p>Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>), Columbia Basin DPS— The following summary is based on information in our files and a petition, dated May 14, 1999, requesting the listing of the Washington population of the western sage-grouse (<i>C. u. phaios</i>). On May 7, 2001, we concluded that listing the Columbia Basin DPS of the western sage-grouse was warranted, but precluded by higher priority listing actions (66 FR 22984); this population was historically found in northern Oregon and central Washington. Following our May 7, 2001, finding, the Service received additional petitions requesting listing actions for various other greater sage-grouse populations, including one for the nominal western subspecies, dated January 24, 2002, and three for the entire species, dated June 18, 2002, and March 19 and December 22, 2003. The Service subsequently found that the petition for the western subspecies did not present substantial information (68 FR 6500; February 7, 2003), and that listing the greater sage-grouse throughout its historical range was not warranted (70 FR 2244; January 12, 2005). These two</p>	<p>November 21, 2012 (cont'd) or distribution across the wide range of the species at this time, and substantial habitat still remains to support the species in many areas. The threats are imminent because the species is currently facing them in many portions of its range. Therefore, we assigned the greater sage-grouse an LPN of 8.</p> <p>Greater sage-grouse, Bi-State DPS (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)—We continue to find that listing this species is warranted, but precluded as of the date of publication of this notice. However, we are working on a proposed listing rule that we expect to publish prior to making the next annual resubmitted petition 12-month finding. In the course of preparing the proposed listing rule, we are continuing to monitor new information about this species' status so that we can make prompt use of our authority under Section 4(b)(7) in the case of an emergency posing a significant risk to the species.</p> <p>Greater sage-grouse, Columbia Basin DPS (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)—The following summary is based on information in our files and a petition, dated May 14, 1999, requesting the listing of the Washington population of the western sage-grouse (<i>C. u. phaios</i>). On May 7, 2001, we concluded that listing the Columbia Basin DPS of the western sage-grouse was warranted, but precluded by higher priority listing actions (66 FR 22984); this population was historically found in northern Oregon and central Washington. Following our May 7, 2001, finding, the Service received additional petitions requesting listing actions for various other greater sage-grouse populations, including one for the nominal western subspecies, dated January 24, 2002, and three for the entire species, dated June 18, 2002, and March 19 and December 22, 2003. The Service subsequently found that the</p>	<p>November 22, 2013 (cont'd) or distribution across the wide range of the species at this time, and substantial habitat still remains to support the species in many areas. The threats are imminent because the species is currently facing them in many portions of its range. Therefore, we assigned the greater sage-grouse an LPN of 8.</p> <p>Greater sage-grouse, Columbia Basin DPS (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)—The following summary is based on information in our files and a petition, dated May 14, 1999, requesting the listing of the Washington population of the western sage-grouse (<i>C. u. phaios</i>). On May 7, 2001, we concluded that listing the Columbia Basin DPS of the western sage-grouse was warranted, but precluded by higher priority listing actions (66 FR 22984); this population was historically found in northern Oregon and central Washington. Following our May 7, 2001, finding, the Service received additional petitions requesting listing actions for various other greater sage-grouse populations, including one for the nominal western subspecies, dated January 24, 2002, and three for the entire species, dated June 18, 2002, and March 19 and December 22, 2003. The Service subsequently found that the petition for the western subspecies did not present substantial information (68 FR 6500; February 7, 2003), and that listing the greater sage-grouse was not warranted (70 FR 2244; January 12, 2005). These latter findings were remanded to the Service for further consideration. In response, we initiated a new range-wide status review for the entire species (73 FR 10218; February 26, 2008). On March 5, 2010, we found that listing of the greater sage-grouse was warranted but precluded by higher priority listing actions (75 FR 13909; March 23, 2010), and it was added to the list of candidates. We also found that the western subspecies of the greater sage-grouse, the taxonomic entity we relied on in our DPS</p>
--	--	---

CNOR text for greater sage-grouse (western, Washington / Columbia DPS, bi-state)

<p>October 26, 2011 (cont'd)</p> <p>findings were challenged, and remanded to the Service for further consideration. In response, we initiated a new range-wide status review for the entire species (73 FR 10218; February 26, 2008). On March 5, 2010, we found that listing of the greater sage-grouse was warranted but precluded by higher priority listing actions (75 FR 13910; March 23, 2010), and it was added to the list of candidates. We also found that the western subspecies of the greater sage-grouse, the taxonomic entity on which we based our DPS analysis for the Columbia Basin population, was no longer considered a valid subspecies. In light of our conclusions regarding the invalidity of the western sage-grouse subspecies, we will now need to analyze the significance of the Columbia Basin DPS to the greater sage-grouse. As priorities allow, the Service intends to complete an analysis to determine if this population continues to warrant recognition as a DPS in accordance with our Policy Regarding the Recognition of Distinct Vertebrate Population Segments (61 FR 4722; February 7, 1996). Until that time, the Columbia Basin DPS will remain a candidate for listing as a separate population of sage-grouse. Even if this population does not meet our DPS policy, the sage-grouse population in the Columbia Basin will remain a candidate for listing as part of the process for listing the greater sage-grouse entity.</p>	<p>November 21, 2012 (cont'd)</p> <p>petition for the western subspecies did not present substantial information (68 FR 6500; February 7, 2003), and that listing the greater sage-grouse throughout its historical range was not warranted (70 FR 2244; January 12, 2005). These latter findings were remanded to the Service for further consideration. In response, we initiated a new range-wide status review for the entire species (73 FR 10218; February 26, 2008). On March 5, 2010, we found that listing of the greater sage-grouse was warranted but precluded by higher priority listing actions (75 FR 13909; March 23, 2010), and it was added to the list of candidates. We also found that the western subspecies of the greater sage-grouse, the taxonomic entity we relied on in our DPS analysis for the Columbia Basin population, was no longer considered a valid subspecies. In light of our conclusions regarding the taxonomic invalidity of the western sage-grouse subspecies, the significance of the Columbia Basin DPS to the greater sage-grouse will require further review. The Service intends to complete an analysis to determine if this population continues to warrant recognition as a DPS in accordance with our Policy Regarding the Recognition of Distinct Vertebrate Population Segments (61 FR 4722; February 7, 1996) at the time we make a listing decision on the status of the greater sage-grouse. Until that time, the Columbia Basin DPS will remain a candidate for listing.</p>	<p>November 22, 2013 (cont'd)</p> <p>analysis for the Columbia Basin population, was no longer considered a valid subspecies. In light of our conclusions regarding the taxonomic invalidity of the western sage-grouse subspecies, the significance of the Columbia Basin DPS to the greater sage-grouse will require further review. The Service intends to complete an analysis to determine if this population continues to warrant recognition as a DPS in accordance with our Policy Regarding the Recognition of Distinct Vertebrate Population Segments (61 FR 4722; February 7, 1996) at the time we make a listing decision on the status of the greater sage-grouse. Until that time, the Columbia Basin DPS will remain a candidate for listing.</p>
--	--	---